



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: the Examiner indicated that amendment to better clarify that the crystallizable thermoplastic consisted of PET, PBT or mixtures thereof, would appear to result in a patentable invention when coupled with the longitudinal modulus limitation. The Examiner noted that Bennett et al., relied upon for the longitudinal modulus limitation, required the addition of specific thermoplastic material other than PET or PBT in order to achieve their disclosed modulus values and the prior art of record did not appear to render obvious or anticipate the invention covered by the proposed claim language. Applicants agreed to the proposed changes..